arXiv:1608.00319v1 [math.GN] 1 Aug 2016

THE TUKEY ORDER AND SUBSETS OF ω_1

PAUL GARTSIDE AND ANA MAMATELASHVILI

Abstract. One partially ordered set, Q, is a *Tukey quotient* of another, P, if there is a map $\phi : P \to Q$ carrying cofinal sets of P to cofinal sets of Q. Two partial orders which are mutual Tukey quotients are said to be *Tukey equivalent*. Let X be a space and denote by $\mathcal{K}(X)$ the set of compact subsets of X, ordered by inclusion. The principal object of this paper is to analyze the Tukey equivalence classes of $\mathcal{K}(S)$ corresponding to various subspaces S of ω_1, their Tukey invariants, and hence the Tukey relations between them. It is shown that ω^ω is a strict Tukey quotient of $\Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$ and thus we distinguish between two Tukey classes out of Isbell's ten partially ordered sets from [14]. The relationships between Tukey equivalence classes of $\mathcal{K}(S)$, where S is a subspace of ω_1, and $\mathcal{K}(M)$, where M is a separable metrizable space, are revealed. Applications are given to function spaces.

1. Introduction

A partially ordered set (poset) is *directed* if every two elements have an upper bound. One directed partially ordered set Q is a *Tukey quotient* of another, P, denoted $P \geq_T Q$, if there is a map $\phi : P \to Q$, called a *Tukey quotient*, that takes cofinal subsets of P to cofinal subsets of Q. Posets that are mutual Tukey quotients are said to be *Tukey equivalent*. The Tukey relation distinguishes between cofinal structures of posets and Tukey equivalence classes are sometimes called cofinality types. Introduced to study Moore-Smith convergence in topology [18, 24], Tukey quotients and equivalence are fundamental notions of order theory, and are being actively investigated, especially in connection with partial orders arising naturally in analysis and topology [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22].

The quest for interesting new Tukey classes began with Isbell's work in [14]. In this paper he presented ten partially ordered sets. The first five of these posets, namely, 1, ω, ω_1, $\omega \times \omega_1$ and $[\omega_1]^{<\omega}$, previously known to be Tukey-distinct, are of size $\leq \omega_1$. The other five partially ordered sets are of size $\mathfrak{c}$. Isbell showed that the extra five posets provide at least two additional Tukey classes because two of them, namely ω^ω and $\Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$, have a certain Tukey invariant property which the other three do not possess (here $\Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$ is the subset of ω^{ω_1} consisting of all elements which are eventually constantly equal to 0). Up until now the Tukey classes of ω^ω and $\Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$ have remained un-distinguished.

Isbell asked a natural question: how many Tukey classes are there of size $\leq \omega_1$? Todorčević in [23] showed that depending on set theoretic assumptions 1, ω, ω_1, $\omega \times \omega_1$ and $[\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ might be the only such posets or there might be 2^{ω_1}, the largest possible number. In order to show the existence of 2^{ω_1}-many distinct Tukey classes

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E04, 06A07, 54F05 (54C35, 54E35).

Key words and phrases. Partial order, Tukey order, compact set, subsets of ω_1, stationary, separable metrizable space.

of posets of size ω_1, Todorčević considered certain special partially ordered sets. For a space X, let $\mathcal{K}(X)$ denote the collection of all compact subsets of X ordered by set inclusion. Todorčević used Tukey classes $\mathcal{K}(S)$, where S is a subset of ω_1.

The main goal of this paper is to understand the Tukey classes $\mathcal{K}(S)$, where S is a subset of ω_1 – what they are, and how they are related. Note that each of 1, ω, ω_1, $\omega \times \omega_1$ and $[\omega_1]^{<\omega}$, as well as ω^ω and $\Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$ have this form. To see this, let S_0 be the set of all isolated points in ω_1, let $S_1 = (\omega \cdot \omega + 1)\backslash\{\omega \cdot n : n \in \omega\}$ and let S_2 be S_0 together with all elements of ω_1 that are limits of limit ordinals. Then $\omega_1 =_T \mathcal{K}(\omega_1)$, $\omega \times \omega_1 =_T \mathcal{K}(\omega_1\backslash\{\omega\})$, $[\omega_1]^{<\omega} =_T \mathcal{K}(S_0)$, $\omega^\omega = \mathcal{K}(S_1)$, and $\Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1}) =_T \mathcal{K}(S_2)$.

In Section 4 we study how posets corresponding to various subsets of ω_1 are divided between different Tukey equivalence classes. We then study the Tukey relations between these classes. In particular, we show that ω^ω is a strict Tukey quotient of $\Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$. In order to distinguish between Tukey classes, in Section 3 we consider Tukey invariants of $\mathcal{K}(S)$'s such as: cofinality, additivity and calibres. In Section 2 we present the relative Tukey ordering, a more general version of the Tukey ordering, as well as related definitions and basic lemmas.

In the last section we give applications. Note that each bounded subset of ω_1 is Polish (i.e. separable and completely metrizable). Posets of the form $\mathcal{K}(M)$, where M is separable and metrizable have been studied extensively [5, 9, 12]. In works of Cascales, Orihuela and Tkachuk a special interest has been given to investigating properties of spaces X such that $\mathcal{K}(M) \geq_T \mathcal{K}(X)$ for some separable metrizable M [3, 4]. We completely solve the problem of which sets $S \subseteq \omega_1$ have the property that $\mathcal{K}(M) \geq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$ for some separable metrizable M. Recently, in [12], the authors constructed $2^\mathfrak{c}$-many Tukey classes of $\mathcal{K}(M)$'s, with M separable and metrizable, and used them to show that there are large families of function spaces corresponding to these M's. Here we use Todorčević's 2^{ω_1}-many distinct Tukey classes of $\mathcal{K}(S)$'s, where S is a subset of ω_1, to derive similar results about function spaces.

2. Definitions and Basic Properties

Let P and Q be directed partially ordered sets. Let P' be a subset of P and Q' be a subset of Q. A subset C of P is *cofinal for* P' (in P) if whenever p' is in P' there is a c in C such that $p' \leq c$ (and similarly for Q). For pairs (P', P) and (Q', Q), a map $\phi : P \to Q$ is a *relative Tukey quotient* if ϕ takes subsets of P cofinal for P' to sets cofinal for Q' in Q, and we write $(P', P) \geq_T (Q', Q)$. Pairs that are mutual relative Tukey quotients are said to be Tukey equivalent. The relative Tukey ordering was introduced in [12]. Note that $(P, P) \geq_T (Q, Q)$ if and only if $P \geq_T Q$. So no ambiguity arises if we abbreviate $(P, P) \geq_T (Q', Q)$ to $P \geq_T (Q', Q)$, and similarly when $Q' = Q$. In this section we will give some basic connections of the (relative) Tukey ordering with order properties of posets. Sketches of proofs of some of these results were presented in [12] and we omit them here. Full proofs can be found in [16].

There is a dual form of relative Tukey quotients. Call $\psi : Q' \to P'$ a relative Tukey map from (Q', Q) to (P', P) if and only if for any $U \subseteq Q'$ unbounded in Q, $\psi(U) \subseteq P'$ is unbounded in P. Recall that a poset P is Dedekind complete if and only if every subset of P with an upper bound has a least upper bound.

Lemma 1. *(1) There is a relative Tukey quotient ϕ from (P', P) to (Q', Q) if and only if there is relative Tukey map ψ from (Q', Q) to (P', P).*

(2) If $(P', P) \geq_T (Q', Q)$ and Q is Dedekind complete then there is a Tukey quotient witnessing this that is order-preserving. Conversely, if $\phi : P \to Q$ is order-preserving and $\phi(P')$ is cofinal for Q' in Q, then ϕ is a relative Tukey quotient from (P', P) to (Q', Q).

(3) If C is a cofinal set of a poset P then C and P are Tukey equivalent.

Note that $\mathcal{K}(X)$ is Dedekind complete for any space X. Hence in this paper – where our posets are always either a $\mathcal{K}(S)$, for some $S \subseteq \omega_1$, or a $\mathcal{K}(M)$ where M is separable and metrizable – we will routinely assume, by part (2) of the above lemma, that any given Tukey quotient is order-preserving. Dedekind completeness can be useful in other ways.

Lemma 2. *For a Dedekind complete poset P, suppose $P = \bigcup_{\alpha\in\kappa} P_\alpha$ and for each α we have $Q \geq_T (P_\alpha, P)$. Then $Q \times [\kappa]^{<\omega} \geq_T P$.*

Proof. As P is Dedekind complete, for each $\alpha < \kappa$, fix an order-preserving $\phi_\alpha : Q \to P$ such that $\phi_\alpha(Q)$ is cofinal for P_α in P. Define $\phi : Q \times [\kappa]^{<\omega} \to P$ by $\phi(q, F) = \sup\{\phi_\alpha(q) : \alpha \in F\}$, which is well-defined since P is directed and Dedekind complete.

Then ϕ is clearly order-preserving. If p is any element of P, then p is in P_α, for some α. Pick q from Q such that $\phi_\alpha(q) \geq p$. Then $\phi(q, \{\alpha\}) = \phi_\alpha(q) \geq p$, and thus ϕ has cofinal image. □

2.1. **Cofinality and additivity.** Define the *cofinality* of P' in P to be $\mathrm{cof}(P', P) = \min\{|C| : C \text{ is cofinal for } P' \text{ in } P\}$. Define the *additivity* of P' in P to be $\mathrm{add}(P, P') = \min\{|S| : S \subseteq P' \text{ and } S \text{ has no upper bound in } P\}$. Then $\mathrm{cof}(P) = \mathrm{cof}(P, P)$ and $\mathrm{add}(P) = \mathrm{add}(P, P)$ coincide with the usual notions of cofinality and additivity of a poset.

Lemma 3. *If $(P', P) \geq_T (Q', Q)$ then $\mathrm{cof}(P', P) \geq \mathrm{cof}(Q', Q)$, and $\mathrm{add}(P', P) \leq \mathrm{add}(Q', Q)$.*

Lemma 4. *The cofinality of P' in P is $\leq \kappa$ if and only if $[\kappa]^{<\omega} \geq_T (P', P)$.*

2.2. **Calibres and Spectra.** Let $\kappa \geq \mu \geq \lambda$ be cardinals. We say that P' has *calibre* (κ, λ, μ) in P (or, (P', P) has caliber (κ, λ, μ)) if for every κ-sized subset T of P' there is a λ-sized subset T_0 such that every μ-sized subset T_1 of T_0 has an upper bound in P. When $P' = P$ this coincides with the standard definition of calibre of a poset. 'Calibre $(\kappa, \lambda, \lambda)$' is abbreviated to 'calibre (κ, λ)' and 'calibre (κ, κ)' is abbreviated to 'calibre κ'.

Lemma 5. *If $(P', P) \geq_T (Q', Q)$, P' has calibre (κ, λ, μ) in P and κ is regular, then Q' has calibre (κ, λ, μ) in Q.*

Lemma 6. *Suppose κ is regular. Then (1) P' fails to have calibre κ in P if and only if $(P', P) \geq_T \kappa$, (2) If $(P', P) \geq_T [\kappa]^{<\lambda}$ then P' fails to have calibre (κ, λ) and the converse is true if $\mathrm{add}(P') \geq \lambda$ (equivalently, all subsets of P' of size $< \lambda$ are bounded in P').*

Proof. Clearly, κ does not have calibre κ. So, by Lemma 5, $(P', P) \geq_T \kappa$ implies that P' does not have calibre κ in P.

Similarly, $[\kappa]^{<\lambda}$ does not have calibre (κ, λ) ($\{\{\alpha\} : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is a κ-sized collection in $[\kappa]^{<\lambda}$ but none of its λ-sized subcollections is bounded in $[\kappa]^{<\lambda}$) and therefore $(P', P) \geq_T [\kappa]^{<\lambda}$ implies that P' fails to have calibre (κ, λ) in P.

On the other hand, suppose P' fails to have calibre κ in P. Then there exists κ-sized $P_0 \subseteq P'$ such that all κ-sized subsets of P_0 are unbounded. Let $\psi : \kappa \to P_0 \subseteq P$ be a bijection. Since κ is regular, all unbounded subsets of κ are κ-sized and their images are unbounded as well. Therefore ϕ is a relative Tukey map.

Similarly, suppose P' fails to have calibre (κ, λ) in P. Then there exists κ-sized $P_1 \subseteq P'$ such that all λ-sized subsets of P_1 are unbounded in P. Let $j : \kappa \to P_1 \subseteq P$ be a bijection. Since $\mathrm{add}(P') \geq \lambda$ we can define $\psi : [\kappa]^{<\lambda} \to P'$ by $\psi(F) =$ an upper bound of $\{j(\alpha) : \alpha \in F\}$ in P'. Suppose U is an unbounded subset of $[\kappa]^{<\lambda}$. This means that $\bigcup U$ has size $\geq \lambda$ and therefore $\{j(\alpha) : \alpha \in \bigcup U\}$, a subset of P_1 of size $\geq \lambda$, is also unbounded in P. Since any bound of $\{\psi(F) : F \in U\}$ is also a bound of $\{j(\alpha) : \alpha \in \bigcup U\}$ in P, we get that $\{\psi(F) : F \in U\}$ is unbounded and ψ is a relative Tukey map. □

The next lemma gives relative versions of known facts on productivity of calibres. The straightforward proof is left to the reader.

Lemma 7. *(1) Both (P', P) and (Q', Q) have calibre (κ, κ, μ) if and only if $(P' \times Q', P \times Q)$ has calibre (κ, κ, μ).*

(2) If P' (or Q') fails to have calibre (κ, λ, μ) in P (respectively, in Q) then $P' \times Q'$ also fails to have calibre (κ, λ, μ) in $P \times Q$.

It is clearly of interest to consider the collection of all regular cardinals κ such that a poset P has calibre κ, but since any regular cardinal $\kappa > |P|$ is a calibre of κ this collection is unbounded. Consequently, we instead study the *spectrum* of P, $\mathrm{spec}(P)$, the set of all regular κ which are *not* calibres of κ. Equivalently, $\mathrm{spec}(P) = \{\kappa : \kappa \text{ is a regular cardinal and } P \geq_T \kappa\}$. Since calibre κ is productive we immediately get the following corollary.

Corollary 8. $\mathrm{spec}(P_1 \times P_2) = \mathrm{spec}(P_1) \cup \mathrm{spec}(P_2)$.

And transitivity of $\leq_T$ yields:

Lemma 9. *If $Q \leq_T P$ then* $\mathrm{spec}(Q) \subseteq \mathrm{spec}(P)$.

Lastly we present a lemma that establishes a close relationship between the spectrum of a poset and its additivity and cofinality. (We write $[\lambda, \mu]^r$ for $\{\kappa : \kappa \text{ is regular and } \lambda \leq \kappa \leq \mu\}$.)

Lemma 10. *Let P be a directed poset without the largest element. Then* $\mathrm{add}(P)$ *and* $\mathrm{cof}(\mathrm{cof}(P))$ *are elements of* $\mathrm{spec}(P)$ *and* $\mathrm{spec}(P) \subseteq [\mathrm{add}(P), \mathrm{cof}(P)]^r$.

2.3. **The Pair $(X, \mathcal{K}(X))$.** If we identify elements of X with corresponding singletons we can view X as a subset of $\mathcal{K}(X)$. Most relative Tukey pairs considered in this paper are of the form $(X, \mathcal{K}(X))$. Note that a subset of $\mathcal{K}(X)$ is cofinal for X in $\mathcal{K}(X)$ if it covers X. So $(X, \mathcal{K}(X)) \geq_T (Y, \mathcal{K}(Y))$ means that there is an order-preserving map from $\mathcal{K}(X)$ to $\mathcal{K}(Y)$ that takes (compact) covers of X to (compact) covers of Y. While $\mathcal{K}(X) \geq_T (Y, \mathcal{K}(Y))$ means that there is an order-preserving map from $\mathcal{K}(X)$ to $\mathcal{K}(Y)$ that takes cofinal subsets of $\mathcal{K}(X)$ to covers of Y. The next lemma is particularly useful.

Lemma 11. *Let A be a closed subspace of a space X. Then $(X, \mathcal{K}(X)) \geq_T (A, \mathcal{K}(A))$, $\mathcal{K}(X) \geq_T \mathcal{K}(A)$, and $\mathcal{K}(X) \geq_T (A, \mathcal{K}(A))$.*

For spaces X and Y, let $X \oplus Y$ denote the free union of X and Y. Then clearly, $\mathcal{K}(X \oplus Y) = \mathcal{K}(X) \times \mathcal{K}(Y)$.

2.4. **Notation.** For the rest of this paper S will always denote a subset of ω_1 and M will denote a separable metrizable space. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of all homeomorphism classes of subsets of ω_1. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the set of all homeomorphism classes of separable metrizable spaces. Let $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S}) = \{[\mathcal{K}(S)]_T : S \in \mathcal{S}\}$ and $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{M}) = \{[\mathcal{K}(M)]_T : M \in \mathcal{M}\}$.

2.5. **Separable Metrizable Spaces.** As mentioned above, each bounded subset of ω_1 is Polish (because it is countable, scattered and metrizable). Therefore we briefly describe the Tukey classes of Polish spaces. In [5] Christensen proved that, for a separable metrizable space M, $\omega^\omega \geq_T \mathcal{K}(M)$ if and only if M is Polish. Based on this result one can obtain the following description of the initial segment of Tukey classes in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{M})$.

Theorem 12 (Christensen, Fremlin [9])**.** *Below M is a separable metrizable space.*

(1) The minimum Tukey equivalence class in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{M})$ is $[1]_T$, and $\mathcal{K}(M)$ is in this class if and only if M is compact;

(2) it has a unique successor, $[\omega]_T$, which consists of all $\mathcal{K}(M)$ where M is locally compact but not compact; and

(3) this has $[\omega^\omega]_T = \{\mathcal{K}(M) : M$ is Polish, not locally compact$\}$ as a unique successor.

The simplest example of a Polish, non-locally compact space is the metric fan. The following observation immediately follows from the above theorem but it can also be shown independently of it using the fact that the metric fan embeds as a closed subspace in M if and only if M fails to be locally compact.

Corollary 13. *Let M be separable, metrizable and non-locally compact. Then $\omega^\omega \leq \mathcal{K}(M)$.*

A similar statement is true for arbitrary subsets of ω_1. Notice that since ω_1 is locally compact, a subset S of ω_1 is locally compact if and only if S is open in its closure, which happens if and only if $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is closed in ω_1. It turns out that when we study various groups of subsets of ω_1 (stationary, co-stationary, closed and unbounded, etc.) it is convenient to work with $\overline{S}\backslash S$.

Lemma 14. *Let S be a subset of ω_1. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) S is locally compact (i.e. $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is closed),

(2) S does not contain a metric fan as a closed subspace, and

(3) $\omega^\omega \not\leq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$.

Proof. Clearly, S is locally compact if and only if $S \cap [0, \alpha]$ is locally compact for each $\alpha \in \omega_1$. Also, since a metric fan is countable and each $S \cap [0, \alpha]$ is closed, S contains a metric fan as a closed subspace if and only if there is some $\alpha \in \omega_1$ such that $S \cap [0, \alpha]$ contains a metric fan as a closed subspace. For any $\alpha \in \omega_1$, $S \cap [0, \alpha]$ is separable and metrizable and therefore it is locally compact if and only if it contains a metric fan as a closed subspace. Therefore (1) and (2) are equivalent.

Lastly, if S contains a metric fan as a closed subspace then $\omega^\omega \leq \mathcal{K}(S)$. If not, then $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is closed, which means $\mathcal{K}(S)$ is Tukey equivalent to either 1, ω or $\omega \times \omega_1$, none of which are above ω^ω in the Tukey order. □

3. Order properties of elements of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S})$

In this section we will consider the Tukey invariants – cofinality, additivity, calibres and spectrum – introduced above, of elements of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S})$.

3.1. **Size and bounds.** Every compact subset K of ω_1 is contained in some initial segment, $[0,\alpha]$. Consequently, $\mathcal{K}(\omega_1) = \bigcup\{\mathcal{K}([0,\alpha]) : \alpha < \omega_1\}$, and for any $S \subseteq \omega_1$, $\mathcal{K}(S) = \bigcup\{\mathcal{K}([0,\alpha] \cap S) : \alpha < \omega_1\}$. So $|\mathcal{K}(S)| \leq \mathfrak{c} \times \omega = \mathfrak{c}$. Whenever S contains a convergent sequence together with its limit, $|K(S)| \geq \mathfrak{c}$ and since compact subsets of discrete spaces are finite we immediately have the following lemma.

Lemma 15. *Let S be a subset of ω_1. The possible sizes of $\mathcal{K}(S)$ are as follows. If S is discrete then: (a) $\mathcal{K}(S)$ is finite if S is finite, (b) $|\mathcal{K}(S)| = \omega$ if S is countable infinite, and (c) $|\mathcal{K}(S)| = \omega_1$ if S is uncountable. If S is not discrete then $|\mathcal{K}(S)| = \mathfrak{c}$.*

By Lemma 4 and the previous lemma we clearly have that $[\mathfrak{c}]^{<\omega}$ bounds each $\mathcal{K}(S)$ from above. We refine this upper bound for $\mathcal{K}(S)$. Recall $\mathcal{K}(S) = \bigcup_{\alpha\in\omega_1} \mathcal{K}(S\cap [0,\alpha])$. Since each $S\cap[0,\alpha]$ is Polish we have $\mathcal{K}(S\cap[0,\alpha]) \leq_T \omega^\omega$, and so we know by Lemma 2 that $\mathcal{K}(S) \leq_T \omega^\omega \times [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$. By Lemma 13, if S is not locally compact then ω^ω is a lower bound of $\mathcal{K}(S)$. Now suppose S is unbounded. Enumerate S as $\{\beta_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$. Since all compact subsets of ω_1 are countable, the map $\psi : \omega_1 \to \mathcal{K}(S)$ given by $\psi(\alpha) = \{\beta_\alpha\}$ is a Tukey map. Hence in this case ω_1 is a lower bound of $\mathcal{K}(S)$.

Lemma 16. *Let S be a subset of ω_1. Then (a) $\mathcal{K}(S) \leq \omega^\omega \times [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$, (b) $\omega^\omega \leq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$ whenever S is non-locally compact, and (c) $\omega_1 \leq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$ whenever S is unbounded.*

3.2. **Additivity and cofinality.** If X is compact then $\mathrm{add}(\mathcal{K}(X))$ is undefined. We compute $\mathrm{add}(\mathcal{K}(S))$ otherwise.

Lemma 17. *Let S be a subset of ω_1. If S is closed and unbounded then* $\mathrm{add}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = \omega_1$. *If S is not closed then* $\mathrm{add}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = \omega$.

Proof. If S is closed and unbounded, every countable subset of $\mathcal{K}(S)$ is bounded, but collection of all singletons of S is not. So, $\mathrm{add}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = \omega_1$. On the other hand if S is not closed, pick a sequence $\{x_n : n \in \omega\}$ in S that does not converge in S. Then $\{\{x_n\} : n \in \omega\}$ is unbounded in $\mathcal{K}(S)$ and $\mathrm{add}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = \omega$. □

We know that $\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{K}(\omega^\omega)) = \mathfrak{d}$. In light of Lemma 16 we have the following.

Lemma 18. *Let S be a subset of ω_1. There are four possibilities for* $\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{K}(S))$.
(1) If S is compact then $\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = 1$.
(2) If $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is closed and S is bounded, then $\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = \omega$.
(3) If $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is closed and S is unbounded, then $\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = \omega_1$.
(4) If $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is not closed, then $\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = \mathfrak{d}$.

Proof. Claim (1) is clear, and (2) follows from Lemma 14. For (3), note that $\mathcal{K}(S) = \bigcup_{\alpha\in\omega_1} \mathcal{K}(S\cap[0,\alpha])$. But by Lemma 14, $\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{K}(S\cap[0,\alpha])) \leq \omega$ for each α and therefore $\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{K}(S)) \leq \omega_1$. Since S is uncountable and all compact subsets are countable $\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{K}(S)) \geq \omega_1$ and we are done.

For (4), by Lemma 16 we have $\omega^\omega \leq_T \mathcal{K}(S) \leq_T \omega^\omega \times [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$. Since $\mathrm{cof}(\omega^\omega) = \mathrm{cof}(\omega^\omega \times [\omega_1]^{<\omega}) = \mathfrak{d}$, we have $\mathrm{cof}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = \mathfrak{d}$. □

3.3. **Spectrum of $\mathcal{K}(S)$.** Spectra associated with separable metrizable spaces were studied in [11]. Particular attention was paid to the spectrum of ω^ω, which is contained in spectra of all $\mathcal{K}(M)$'s and $\mathcal{K}(S)$'s if M's and S's are non-locally compact.

It turns out that $\text{spec}(\omega^\omega)$ can be consistently equal to any finite set of regular cardinals as well as some infinite sets of regular cardinals. Here we compute $\text{spec}(\mathcal{K}(S))$ in terms of $\text{spec}(\omega^\omega)$. If S is a bounded subset of ω_1 then $\mathcal{K}(S)$ is Tukey equivalent to either $\mathcal{K}(1)$ or $\mathcal{K}(\omega)$ or $\mathcal{K}(\omega^\omega)$. So the interesting case for the spectrum of $\mathcal{K}(S)$ is when S is unbounded.

Theorem 19. *Suppose $S \subseteq \omega_1$ is unbounded. If $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is closed then* $\text{spec}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = \{\omega_1\}$ *and if $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is not closed then* $\text{spec}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = \{\omega_1\} \cup \text{spec}(\omega^\omega)$.

Proof. For unbounded S, $\omega_1 \leq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$. If $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is closed then $\text{cof}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = \omega_1$ and $\kappa \leq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$ implies $\text{cof}(\kappa) \leq \omega_1$. So κ must be equal to ω_1 and $\text{spec}(\mathcal{K}(S)) = \{\omega_1\}$.

If $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is not closed then $\omega^\omega \times \omega_1 \leq_T \mathcal{K}(S) \leq_T \omega^\omega \times [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$. And $\text{spec}(\omega^\omega \times \omega_1) \subseteq \text{spec}(\mathcal{K}(S)) \subseteq \text{spec}(\omega^\omega \times [\omega_1]^{<\omega})$. But from Corollary 8, it is clear that $\text{spec}(\omega^\omega \times \omega_1) = \{\omega_1\} \cup \text{spec}(\omega^\omega) = \text{spec}(\omega^\omega \times [\omega_1]^{<\omega})$. □

3.4. **Calibres of $\mathcal{K}(S)$.** Let S be a subset of ω_1. Since $\mathcal{K}(S)$ has size at most $\mathfrak{c}$ we focus on calibres ω_1, $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$ and (ω_1, ω). Calibres for $\mathcal{K}(S)$'s when S is bounded are known using facts about calibres of $\mathcal{K}(M)$'s given in [11]. If $\mathcal{K}(S)$ is Tukey equivalent to 1 or ω then $\mathcal{K}(S)$ has calibres ω_1, $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$ and (ω_1, ω); If $\mathcal{K}(S)$ is Tukey equivalent to ω^ω then $\mathcal{K}(S)$ has calibre (ω_1, ω) but has the other two calibres if and only if $\omega_1 < \mathfrak{b}$.

Now let S be unbounded. We showed that $\omega_1 \leq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$ and therefore $\mathcal{K}(S)$ fails to have calibre ω_1. The case of calibre (ω_1, ω) has already been settled by Todorčević in [23]. Recall that a subset of an ordinal is called stationary if and only if it meets every closed and unbounded subset of ω_1. Using the fact that $\mathcal{K}(S) \geq [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ if and only if $\mathcal{K}(S)$ does not have calibre (ω_1, ω), Todorčević's theorem becomes:

Lemma 20 (Todorčević)**.** *Let $S \subseteq \omega_1$ be unbounded. Then $\mathcal{K}(S)$ has calibre (ω_1, ω) if and only if S is stationary if and only if $\mathcal{K}(S) \not\geq [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$.*

In fact, Todorčević shows that if S is not stationary then S contains an uncountable closed discrete subset, which gives an uncountable collection of singletons such that any infinite subcollection is unbounded in $\mathcal{K}(S)$.

Lemma 21 (Todorčević)**.** *Suppose S is unbounded, C is closed, unbounded and $S \cap C = \emptyset$. Then there exist strictly increasing sequences $\{s_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\} \subseteq S$ and $\{c_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\} \subseteq C$ such that for each $\alpha < \omega_1$, $s_\alpha < c_\alpha < s_{\alpha+1}$. Hence, S contains an uncountable closed discrete subset.*

Next we show exactly when $\mathcal{K}(S)$ has calibre $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$. Recall that a subset of ω_1 is called co-stationary if its complement is stationary. Equivalently S is not co-stationary if and only if it contains a cub (closed and unbounded) set. Note that if S is unbounded and $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is bounded then S is co-stationary. In particular, $S\backslash(\sup(\overline{S}\backslash S) + 1)$ is a cub subset of S.

Lemma 22. *Let $S \subseteq \omega_1$ be unbounded. Then $\mathcal{K}(S)$ has calibre $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$ if and only if $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is bounded and either $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is closed or $\omega_1 < \mathfrak{b}$.*

Proof. Let S be an unbounded subset of ω_1 and suppose $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is bounded. Let $\alpha = (\sup(\overline{S}\backslash S) + 1)$. Then $S\backslash\alpha$ is closed and unbounded in ω_1 and S is the free union of $S \cap \alpha$ and $S\backslash\alpha$, which implies $\mathcal{K}(S) = \mathcal{K}(S \cap \alpha) \times \mathcal{K}(S\backslash\alpha) = \mathcal{K}(S \cap \alpha) \times \omega_1$. Clearly, ω_1 has calibre $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$. So by Lemma 7, $\mathcal{K}(S)$ has calibre $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$ if and only if $\mathcal{K}(S \cap \alpha)$ does. Since $S \cap \alpha$ is Polish, $\mathcal{K}(S \cap \alpha)$ has calibre $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$

if and only if either $\overline{S \cap \alpha}\backslash(S \cap \alpha)$ is closed or $\omega_1 < \mathfrak{b}$. Then, by the fact that $\overline{S}\backslash S = \overline{S \cap \alpha}\backslash(S \cap \alpha)$, $\mathcal{K}(S)$ has calibre $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$ if and only if either $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is a closed or $\omega_1 < \mathfrak{b}$.

What is left to show is that if $\mathcal{K}(S)$ has calibre $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$ then $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is bounded. Suppose S has calibre $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$. First we show that S contains a cub set. Let $\mathcal{K} = \{\{\alpha\} : \alpha \in S\}$. Then there is an uncountable $\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ with every countable subset bounded in $\mathcal{K}(S)$. If we let $T = \bigcup \mathcal{K}'$, then every limit point of T lies in S: otherwise pick $\beta \in \omega_1\backslash S$ and $\{\alpha_n\}_{n\in\omega} \subseteq T$ with $\beta = \sup\{\alpha_n\}_{n\in\omega}$. Then $\{\{\alpha_n\} : n \in \omega\}$ does not have an upper bound in $\mathcal{K}(S)$. So, $C = \overline{T}$ is closed and unbounded subset of S.

Therefore $\omega_1\backslash S$ is non-stationary. If $\omega_1\backslash S$ is also unbounded, apply Lemma 21 to $\omega_1\backslash S$ and C to get strictly increasing sequences $\{s_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\} \subseteq \omega_1\backslash S$ and $\{c_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\} \subseteq C$ such that for each $\alpha < \omega_1$, $s_\alpha < c_\alpha < s_{\alpha+1}$.

Since $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is non-stationary in $\overline{S}$, which is homeomorphic to ω_1, we may assume that $\overline{S} = \omega_1$. *Then all successor ordinals are in* S.

Let $\alpha \in \omega_1$. Considering how s_α'a and c_α's were chosen, $s_\alpha > \sup(\{s_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \cup \{c_\beta : \beta < \alpha\})$. Since s_α is a limit ordinal, we can pick an increasing sequence, $\{s_{\alpha,m}\}_{m\in\omega}$, of successor ordinals in the interval $(\sup(\{s_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \cup \{c_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}), s_\alpha)$ that converges to s_α.

For each infinite $\alpha \in \omega_1$ let $f_\alpha : \alpha \to \omega$ be a bijection. Fix infinite $\alpha \in \omega_1$ and define $K_\alpha = \overline{\{s_{\sigma,f_\alpha(\sigma)} : \sigma \in \alpha\}}$. For each $\sigma, \sigma' \in \alpha$ with $\sigma < \sigma'$, $s_{\sigma,f_\alpha(\sigma)} < c_\sigma < s_{\sigma',f_\alpha(\sigma')}$. So every limit point of $\{s_{\sigma,f_\alpha(\sigma)} : \sigma \in \alpha\}$ is also a limit point of $\{c_\sigma : \sigma \in \alpha\}$ and therefore lies in $C \subseteq S$. Therefore, since $\{s_{\sigma,f_\alpha(\sigma)} : \sigma \in \alpha\} \subseteq S$, K_α is in $\mathcal{K}(S)$.

If $T \subseteq \omega_1$ is uncountable, we will show that $\{K_\alpha : \alpha \in T\}$ contains a countable subset that is unbounded in $\mathcal{K}(S)$. For this it will suffice to find $\sigma \in \omega_1$ such that $A_\sigma = \{f_\alpha(\sigma) : \alpha \in T,\ \alpha > \sigma\}$ is infinite; because then for each $n \in A_\sigma$, we can pick $\alpha_n \in T$ with $f_{\alpha_n}(\sigma) = n$, which will imply that $\bigcup_{n\in A_\sigma} K_{\alpha_n}$ contains an infinite subset of $\{s_{\sigma,m} : m \in \omega\}$ and therefore is unbounded in $\mathcal{K}(S)$.

Suppose, to get a contradiction, that for each $\sigma \in \omega_1$ there is $n_\sigma \in \omega$ that bounds $\{f_\alpha(\sigma) : \alpha \in T,\ \alpha > \sigma\}$. Then there is uncountable $T_1 \subseteq \omega_1$ and $n \in \omega$ such that $n_\sigma = n$ for all $\sigma \in T_1$. Since T and T_1 are uncountable, there is $\alpha \in T$ such that $\alpha \cap T_1$ is infinite. Then we have $f_\alpha(\sigma) \leq n$ for all $\sigma \in \alpha \cap T_1$, which contradicts the fact that f_α is a bijection.

□

4. Structure of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S})$

In this section we compute the Tukey classes, $[\mathcal{K}(S)]_T$, that correspond to subsets S of ω_1. It turns out that the class depends on whether or not a subset is bounded, locally compact, stationary and co-stationary. We then go on to determine the relations between these Tukey classes under the Tukey order.

By Theorem 12, for bounded $S \subseteq \omega_1$ the poset $\mathcal{K}(S)$ is Tukey equivalent to one of 1, ω or ω^ω if S is, respectively, compact, locally compact non-compact or non-locally compact. Now we assume that $S \subseteq \omega_1$ is unbounded and consider different cases depending on the behavior of $\overline{S}\backslash S$. If $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is bounded then there is a closed unbounded $C \subseteq \omega_1$ and bounded $N \subseteq \omega_1$ such that $S = N \oplus C$ and therefore $\mathcal{K}(S) = \mathcal{K}(N) \times \mathcal{K}(C)$. Since any closed unbounded subset of ω_1 is homeomorphic to ω_1 and initial segments of ω_1 are cofinal in $\mathcal{K}(\omega_1)$, we have

$\mathcal{K}(S) = \mathcal{K}(N) \times \mathcal{K}(\omega_1) = \mathcal{K}(N) \times \omega_1$. Therefore, if $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is bounded, $\mathcal{K}(S)$ is Tukey equivalent to one of $1 \times \omega_1 =_T \omega_1$, $\omega \times \omega_1$ or $\omega^\omega \times \omega_1$ depending on whether S is closed unbounded, locally compact but not closed or non-locally compact.

The next case to consider is when $\overline{S}\backslash S$ contains a closed unbounded set. Then S is non-stationary and, by Lemma 20, $\mathcal{K}(S) \geq_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$. If S is non-locally compact then we also have that $\mathcal{K}(S) \geq_T \omega^\omega$ and since $[\omega_1]^{<\omega} \times \omega^\omega$ is Tukey-above all elements of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S})$, we have $\mathcal{K}(S) =_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega} \times \omega^\omega$. Therefore, since there exist non-locally compact non-stationary subsets of ω_1 (for instance, the set of all isolated points together with $\omega \cdot \omega$), we see that $[\omega_1]^{<\omega} \times \omega^\omega$ is the largest element in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S})$. On the other hand, if S is locally compact, then $S \cap [0, \alpha] \leq_T \omega$ for all $\alpha \in \omega_1$ and, by Lemma 2, $\mathcal{K}(S) \leq_T \omega \times [\omega_1]^{<\omega} =_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$. Therefore $\mathcal{K}(S) =_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$.

The most interesting case is when $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is unbounded and does not contain a closed unbounded set. First suppose $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is non-stationary. Then S contains a closed unbounded set and we have the following result.

Proposition 23. *Let S be a subset of ω_1 such that $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is unbounded and S contains a cub set. Then $\mathcal{K}(S) =_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$.*

Proof. Fix S as above and let $C \subseteq S$ be a cub set. We want to construct a cub set $C' = \{\beta_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\} \subseteq C$ such that for each $\alpha \in \omega_1$, $\mathcal{K}([\beta_\alpha, \beta_{\alpha+1}] \cap S) =_T \omega^\omega$. Suppose we have constructed the desired β_γ for each $\gamma < \alpha$. First let α be a successor. Then since $(\overline{S}\backslash S) \cap (\alpha - 1, \omega_1)$ is not closed, there exists $\beta_\alpha \in C$ such that $[\beta_{\alpha-1}, \beta_\alpha] \cap S$ contains a metric fan as a closed subspace and therefore $\mathcal{K}([\beta_{\alpha-1}, \beta_\alpha] \cap S) =_T \omega^\omega$. If α is a limit, let $\beta_\alpha = \sup\{\beta_\gamma : \gamma < \alpha\}$. This sequence clearly works.

For each $K \in \mathcal{K}(S)$, there exists the smallest $\alpha_K \in \omega_1$ such that $K = \bigcup_{\gamma<\alpha_K} K \cap [\beta_\gamma, \beta_{\gamma+1}]$. Clearly, each $K \cap [\beta_\gamma, \beta_{\gamma+1}] \in \mathcal{K}([\beta_\gamma, \beta_{\gamma+1}] \cap S)$. And for any choice of $\alpha \in \omega_1$ and $K_\gamma \in \mathcal{K}([\beta_\gamma, \beta_{\gamma+1}] \cap S)$ for $\gamma < \alpha$, $\overline{\bigcup_{\gamma<\alpha} K_\gamma} \in \mathcal{K}(S)$.

We now show that $\mathcal{K}(S) =_T \Sigma((\omega^\omega)^{\omega_1})$. Since $\Sigma((\omega^\omega)^{\omega_1})$ is clearly order-isomorphic to $\Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$, that will complete the proof.

To show $\mathcal{K}(S) \geq_T \Sigma((\omega^\omega)^{\omega_1})$, fix Tukey quotients $\phi_\alpha : \mathcal{K}([\beta_\alpha, \beta_{\alpha+1}] \cap S) \to \omega^\omega$ for each $\alpha \in \omega_1$. Define $\phi : \mathcal{K}(S) \to \Sigma((\omega^\omega)^{\omega_1})$ by $\phi(K) = \Pi_{\gamma<\alpha_K} \phi_\gamma(K \cap [\beta_\gamma, \beta_{\gamma+1}])$. Clearly, ϕ is order-preserving. It is also cofinal since for any choice of functions $f_\gamma \in \omega^\omega$ for $\gamma < \alpha$, there is $K_\gamma \in \mathcal{K}([\beta_\gamma, \beta_{\gamma+1}] \cap S)$ such that $\phi_\gamma(K_\gamma) \geq f_\gamma$. Then $\phi(\overline{\bigcup_{\gamma<\alpha} K_\gamma}) \geq \Pi_{\gamma<\alpha} f_\gamma$.

For the other direction, fix Tukey quotients $\phi'_\alpha : \omega^\omega \to \mathcal{K}([\beta_\alpha, \beta_{\alpha+1}] \cap S)$ for each $\alpha \in \omega_1$. Define $\phi' : \Sigma((\omega^\omega)^{\omega_1}) \to \mathcal{K}(S)$ by $\phi'(\Pi_{\gamma<\alpha_K} f_\gamma) = \overline{\bigcup_{\gamma<\alpha} \phi'(f_\gamma)}$. Clearly, ϕ' is order-preserving and cofinal. □

The remaining case is when S is stationary and co-stationary (and therefore $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is unbounded and does not contain a closed unbounded set). The following result by Todorčević proven in [23] shows that there are 2^{ω_1}-many classes corresponding to stationary and co-stationary subsets of ω_1.

Theorem 24 (Todorčević)**.** *Let S and S' be unbounded subsets of ω_1. Then $\mathcal{K}(S) \geq \mathcal{K}(S')$ implies that $S\backslash S'$ is non-stationary.*

In the proof the author shows that if $S\backslash S'$ is stationary then for any function $g : \mathcal{K}(S') \to \mathcal{K}(S)$ there is a collection of *singletons* in $\mathcal{K}(S')$ such that their image under g is bounded. So, in fact, the author proves that if $S\backslash S'$ is stationary, then

there is no *relative* Tukey map from S' to $\mathcal{K}(S)$. Now the fact that ω_1 splits into ω_1-many pairwise disjoint stationary subsets gives the following theorem.

Theorem 25 (Todorčević)**.** *There is a 2^{ω_1}-sized family, $\mathcal{A}$, of subsets of ω_1 such that for distinct S and T from $\mathcal{A}$ we have $\mathcal{K}(S) \not\geq_T (T, \mathcal{K}(T))$ and $\mathcal{K}(T) \not\geq_T (S, \mathcal{K}(S))$.*

Since $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S})$ has size $\leq 2^{\omega_1}$ we immediately have the following corollary.

Corollary 26. *We have $|\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S})| = 2^{\omega_1}$ and $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S})$ contains an antichain of size 2^{ω_1}.*

Theorem 24 shows that if subsets of ω_1 differ by stationary-many points, then the corresponding Tukey classes also differ. It turns out that, except in trivial cases, the converse is also true.

Proposition 27. *Let S and T be a subsets of ω_1 such that $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is unbounded, S is stationary and $S\Delta T$ is non-stationary. Then $\mathcal{K}(S) \geq_T \mathcal{K}(T)$.*

Proof. Let S and T be as above. Since $S\Delta T$ is non-stationary, it contains uncountable closed discrete subset, D. Enumerate $D = \{\beta_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ in increasing order. Let $\beta_{<\alpha} = \sup\{\beta_\gamma : \gamma < \alpha\}$ for each α (let $\beta_{<0} = 0$). Since $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is unbounded, we can refine D so that $\mathcal{K}([\beta_{<\alpha}, \beta_\alpha] \cap S) =_T \omega^\omega$ for each $\alpha \in \omega_1$. Since D is a closed subset of $S\Delta T$, for each limit ordinal α, $\beta_{<\alpha}$ is either in both S and T or in neither.

For each $K \in \mathcal{K}(S)$, there exists the smallest $\alpha_K \in \omega_1$ such that $K = \bigcup_{\gamma<\alpha_K} K \cap [\beta_{<\gamma}, \beta_\gamma]$. Clearly, each $K \cap [\beta_{<\gamma}, \beta_\gamma] \in \mathcal{K}([\beta_{<\gamma}, \beta_\gamma] \cap S)$. Fix Tukey quotient maps $\phi_\alpha : \mathcal{K}([\beta_{<\alpha}, \beta_\alpha] \cap S) \to \mathcal{K}([\beta_{<\alpha}, \beta_\alpha] \cap T)$ for each α (assume that for each α, $\phi_\alpha(\emptyset) = \emptyset$). Define $\phi : \mathcal{K}(S) \to \mathcal{K}(T)$ by $\phi(K) = \overline{\bigcup_{\gamma<\alpha_K} \phi_\gamma(K \cap [\beta_{<\gamma}, \beta_\gamma])}$. Then since for each limit ordinal α, $\beta_{<\alpha}$ is either in both S and T or in neither, we have $\phi(K) \in \mathcal{K}(T)$. Clearly, ϕ is order-preserving.

To show that $\phi(\mathcal{K}(S))$ is cofinal in $\mathcal{K}(T)$, let $L \in \mathcal{K}(T)$. Then there is α_L such that $K = \bigcup_{\gamma<\alpha_L} L \cap [\beta_{<\gamma}, \beta_\gamma]$. Since each ϕ_γ is cofinal, there is $K_\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(S \cap [\beta_{<\gamma}, \beta_\gamma])$ such that $L \cap [\beta_{<\gamma}, \beta_\gamma] \subseteq \phi_\gamma(K_\gamma)$. If $L \cap [\beta_{<\gamma}, \beta_\gamma] = \emptyset$ then we may choose $K_\gamma = \emptyset$. Then since for each limit ordinal α, $\beta_{<\alpha}$ is either in both S and T or in neither, we get that $K = \overline{\bigcup_{\gamma<\alpha_L} K_\gamma}$ is a compact subset of S and $L \subseteq \phi(K)$. □

Corollary 28. *Let S and T be both stationary and co-stationary and suppose $S\Delta T$ is non-stationary. Then $\mathcal{K}(S) =_T \mathcal{K}(T)$.*

The Tukey classes in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S})$ and their relations are summarized in Figure 4. The lines indicate that node to the right is strictly Tukey-above the one on the left. Solid lines indicate there is nothing strictly between the connected classes. Text in the boxes describes the corresponding equivalence classes. Note that the 'stationary, co-stationary' category contains the maximal antichain in Todorčević's theorem.


S unbounded, $\overline{S}\backslash S \neq \emptyset$ closed and bounded
S bounded, $\overline{S}\backslash S$ not closed
S bounded, $\overline{S}\backslash S \neq \emptyset$ closed
S unbounded, $\overline{S}\backslash S$ not closed but bounded
S stationary, not co-stationary, $\overline{S}\backslash S$ unbounded
ω^ω
$=_T$ iff $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{b}$
ω
$\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega$
$\Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$
1
$\omega_1 \times \omega$
S stationary, co-stationary
$[\omega_1]^{<\omega} \times \omega^\omega$
$=_T$ iff $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{d}$
S compact
ω_1
$[\omega_1]^{<\omega}$
S unbounded, non-stationary, $\overline{S}\backslash S$ not closed
S closed, unbounded
S unbounded, non-stationary, $\overline{S}\backslash S \neq \emptyset$ closed

Figure 4. Classes of $\mathcal{K}(S)$

It remains to justify the Tukey relations claimed in Figure 4. Some of these Tukey relations follow easily from results given so far. For example, by Theorem 12, $1 <_T \omega <_T \omega^\omega$. Since all countable subsets of ω_1 are bounded, ω and ω_1 are Tukey-incomparable and $\omega, \omega_1 <_T \omega_1 \times \omega$. It is clear that $\omega^\omega \times [\omega_1]^{<\omega} \geq_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ and, by Lemma 18, $[\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ and $\omega^\omega \times [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ are Tukey equivalent if and only if $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{d}$. Also, by Lemma 18, $\omega^\omega \leq_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ if and only if $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{d}$. Clearly, $\omega^\omega \times \omega_1 \geq_T \omega^\omega$ and since $\omega^\omega \geq_T \omega_1$ if and only if $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{b}$, we have that $\omega^\omega \times \omega_1 =_T \omega^\omega$ if and only if $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{b}$. By Lemma 20, $[\omega_1]^{<\omega} \not\leq_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$ and for stationary, co-stationary S, $[\omega_1]^{<\omega} \not\leq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$. Other relations require a little more work.

Lemma 29.

(a) $\omega_1 \times \omega <_T \omega_1 \times \omega^\omega$.
(b) $\omega \times \omega_1 <_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$.
(c) $\omega_1 \times \omega \not\geq_T \omega^\omega$ *and* $\omega_1 \times \omega <_T \omega^\omega$ *if and only if* $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{b}$.
(d) $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega \not\geq_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ *and* $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega <_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ *if and only if* $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{d}$.
(e) $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega \leq_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1}) <_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega} \times \omega^\omega$.
(f) *If S is stationary and co-stationary, then* $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega <_T \mathcal{K}(S) <_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega} \times \omega^\omega$.
(g) *If S is stationary and co-stationary, then* $\mathcal{K}(S) \not\leq_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$.

Proof. (a) The map $\psi : \omega_1 \times \omega \to \omega_1 \times \omega^\omega$ defined by $\psi((\alpha, n)) = (\alpha, (n, 0, 0, 0, \ldots))$ witnesses $\omega_1 \times \omega \leq_T \omega_1 \times \omega^\omega$. Since both ω and ω_1 have calibre $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$, $\omega_1 \times \omega$ must also have this calibre. So, if $\omega_1 \times \omega \geq_T \omega_1 \times \omega^\omega$, $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega$ must have calibre $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$ as well. But $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega$ has calibre $(\omega_1, \omega_1, \omega)$ if and only if ω^ω does, which happens if and only if $\omega_1 < \mathfrak{b}$. However, when $\omega_1 < \mathfrak{b}$, $\mathrm{cof}(\omega_1 \times \omega) = \aleph_1 < \mathfrak{d} = \mathrm{cof}(\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega)$ and we cannot have $\omega_1 \times \omega \geq_T \omega_1 \times \omega^\omega$.

(b) Clearly, $\omega <_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$. The map $\psi : \omega_1 \to [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ defined by $\psi(\alpha) = \{\alpha\}$ is a Tukey map. So, we have $\omega \times \omega_1 \leq_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$. For strict inequality, recall that $[\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ does not have calibre (ω_1, ω), while $\omega \times \omega_1$ clearly does.

(c) Since $\omega_1 \times \omega \geq_T \omega_1$ and ω_1, ω^ω are Dedekind complete, $\omega_1 \times \omega \geq_T \omega^\omega$ implies $\omega_1 \times \omega \geq_T \omega_1 \times \omega^\omega$, which is not true. So $\omega_1 \times \omega \not\geq_T \omega^\omega$. Also, since $\omega <_T \omega^\omega$, $\omega_1 \times \omega <_T \omega^\omega$ if and only if $\omega_1 <_T \omega^\omega$, which happens if and only if $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{b}$.

(d) Since every countable subset of ω_1 is bounded and ω^ω has calibre (ω_1, ω), $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega$ also has calibre (ω_1, ω), while $[\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ does not have it, hence $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega \not\geq_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$. We know $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega <_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ if and only if $\mathrm{cof}(\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega) \leq \omega_1$, which happens if and only if $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{d}$.

(e) We have already proved that $\Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1}) =_T \mathcal{K}(S)$, where S is stationary, not co-stationary and $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is unbounded. In this case $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is not closed and therefore S contains a metric fan as a closed subset. So $\omega^\omega \leq_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$. On the other hand, for every unbounded S, $\omega_1 \leq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$. So, $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega \leq_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$. The inequality is strict because $[\omega_1]^{<\omega} \leq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$ if and only if S is not stationary.

(f) For a stationary, co-stationary S, $\overline{S}\backslash S$, is not closed and by the same argument as in (j), $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega \leq_T \mathcal{K}(S) <_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega} \times \omega^\omega$. To show that the first inequality is also strict, recall that $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega \leq_T \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{Q})$ [11]. Therefore $\mathcal{K}(S) \leq_T \omega_1 \times \omega^\omega$ implies $(S, \mathcal{K}(S)) \leq_T \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{Q})$, which contradicts Lemma 31.

(g) Let S' be stationary and not co-stationary and suppose $\mathcal{K}(S) \leq_T \mathcal{K}(S')$. Then by Todorčević's theorem $S'\backslash S$ must be non-stationary. But $S'\backslash S = S' \cap \omega_1 \backslash S$ and since S' contains a cub set and $\omega_1 \backslash S$ is stationary, their intersection should also be stationary. Therefore we get $\mathcal{K}(S) \not\leq_T \mathcal{K}(S') =_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$. □

Lastly we have to prove that $\omega^\omega <_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$ and $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega <_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$. Recalling that $\omega^\omega =_T \mathcal{K}(\omega^\omega)$, we show something more general than $\omega^\omega <_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$ in Proposition 30. Proposition 30 distinguishes between two of Isbell's ten posets. Since $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{Q}) \geq_T \omega_1 \times \omega^\omega$, Proposition 30 immediately implies that $\omega_1 \times \omega^\omega <_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$.

Proposition 30. *For any separable metrizable M, $\mathcal{K}(M) \not\geq_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$.*

Proof. For a subset A, and element p, of a poset P, we write $A \leq p$ if p is an upper bound of A. Suppose for a contradiction that M is separable metrizable, and $\phi : \mathcal{K}(M) \to \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$ is order-preserving and cofinal. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a countable base for M closed under finite unions.

Claim 1. *Given α in ω_1 and K in $\mathcal{K}(M)$, there is a B in $\mathcal{B}$ containing K and m such that $\phi(\mathcal{K}(B))(\alpha) \leq m$.*

Proof. Fix the α and K. Fix a descending sequence $B_1 \supseteq B_2 \supseteq \cdots$ in $\mathcal{B}$ forming a base for K in M. If the claim were false then for each n there would be a K_n, a compact subset of B_n, such that $\phi(K_n)(\alpha) > n$. Set $K_\infty = K \cup \bigcup_n K_n$. Then K_∞ is compact, and is an upper bound of all the K_n's. As ϕ is order-preserving, $\phi(K_\infty)$ is an upper bound of the $\phi(K_n)$'s. But $\phi(K_n)(\alpha) > n$, for each n. Contradiction. □

Define, for B in $\mathcal{B}$, m in ω and α in ω_1:

$$T_{B,m} = \{\alpha \in \omega_1 : \phi(\mathcal{K}(B))(\alpha) \leq m\}, \text{ and } F_\alpha = \bigcap \{T_{B,m} : \alpha \in T_{B,m}\}.$$

Claim 2. *For every α the set F_α is finite and contains α.*

Proof. Fix α. Clearly α is in F_α, for every α. If F_α were infinite then there would be a subset $\{\delta_n : n \in \omega\}$ of F_α where $\delta_n \neq \delta_{n'}$ if $n \neq n'$. Define τ in $\Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$ by $\tau(\delta_n) = n$ for each n, and zero elsewhere. Since ϕ is cofinal there is a K in $\mathcal{K}(M)$ such that $\phi(K) \geq \tau$. By Claim 1, there is a B in $\mathcal{B}$ containing K and m such that $\phi(\mathcal{K}(B))(\alpha) \leq m$. For each n, since δ_n is in F_α we must have $\phi(\mathcal{K}(B))(\delta_n) \leq m$. But K is in $\mathcal{K}(B)$ and $\phi(K)(\delta_n) \geq \tau(\delta_n) = n$ for every n in ω. Contradiction. □

Claim 3. *For any α and countably infinite $C \supseteq F_\alpha$ there is a B in $\mathcal{B}$ and m such that $F_\alpha \subseteq T_{B,m}$ and $T_{B,m} \cap C$ is finite.*

Proof. Fix the α and C. Write $C = \{\gamma_n : n \in \omega\}$. Define τ in $\Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$ by $\tau(\gamma_n) = n$, and is otherwise zero. As ϕ is cofinal, there is a K in $\mathcal{K}(M)$ such that $\phi(K) \geq \tau$. By Claim 1 there is a B in $\mathcal{B}$ containing K and m such that $\phi(\mathcal{K}(B))(\alpha) \leq m$. By definition of $T_{B,m}$ we see that α is in $T_{B,m}$, and hence, by definition of F_α, clearly $F_\alpha \subseteq T_{B,m}$. For $n > m$ we have $\phi(K)(\gamma_n) \geq n > m$. Since $K \in \mathcal{K}(B)$ it follows that for $n > m$ no γ_n is in $T_{B,m}$, and hence $T_{B,m} \cap C$ is finite. □

To complete the proof of Proposition 30 we show that the claimed properties of the $T_{B,m}$'s and F_α's lead to the desired contradiction. Since $\alpha \in F_\alpha$ and the F_α's are finite (Claim 2), we can recursively pick α_δ for each δ in ω_1, an increasing sequence such that $\alpha_\delta \in F_{\alpha_\delta}$ but $\alpha_\delta \notin \bigcup_{\gamma<\delta} F_{\alpha_\gamma}$. Let $C_\delta = \bigcup_{\gamma\leq\delta} F_{\alpha_\gamma}$. Note that C_δ is countably infinite and contains α_δ.

For each δ we know (Claim 3) there is a B_δ and m_δ such that $\alpha_\delta \in T_{B_\delta,m_\delta}$ and $T_{B_\delta,m_\delta} \cap C_\delta$ is finite. Since $\mathcal{B}$ is countable there is an uncountable $S \subseteq \omega_1$, a B in $\mathcal{B}$ and m such that $B_\delta = B$ and $m_\delta = m$ for all δ in S. Let $\{\delta_n : n \in \omega\}$ be an infinite subset of S and δ_∞ in S such that $\delta_\infty \geq \delta_n$ for all n. Then $T_{B,m} \cap C_{\delta_\infty} \supseteq T_{B,m} \cap C_{\delta_n}$ contains α_{δ_n} for every n, but $T_{B,m} \cap C_{\delta_\infty}$ is finite. Contradiction. □

5. Applications

5.1. **Elements of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{S})$ Tukey-below some $\mathcal{K}(M)$.** Work on the Tukey ordering pursued by Cascades, Orihuela and Tkachuk focuses on understanding spaces X such that $\mathcal{K}(X)$ sits Tukey-below $\mathcal{K}(M)$ for some separable metrizable space M, or more generally, when X has a compact cover that is ordered by $\mathcal{K}(M)$ (i.e. $\mathcal{K}(M) \geq_T (X, \mathcal{K}(X))$). In this subsection we will show precisely which subsets of ω_1 satisfy these conditions.

It turns out that the condition $\mathcal{K}(M) \geq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$ is rather restrictive. Since $\mathcal{K}(M)$ always has calibre (ω_1, ω), it is not possible to have $\mathcal{K}(M) \geq_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega} \times \omega^\omega$ or $\mathcal{K}(M) \geq_T [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$. Proposition 30 says that $\mathcal{K}(M) \geq_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$ never happens. The next lemma further narrows down the possibilities.

Lemma 31. *Suppose $S \subseteq \omega_1$ is unbounded and there is separable metric M such that $\mathcal{K}(M) \geq_T (S, \mathcal{K}(S))$. Then S is not co-stationary.*

Proof. Suppose $\phi : \mathcal{K}(M) \to \mathcal{K}(S)$ is order-preserving and the image of ϕ covers S. Then as in Proposition 2.6 of [4] let $\mathcal{B}$ be a countable base of M that is closed under finite unions and finite intersections and for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$ define $G(B) = \bigcup\{\phi(K) : K \subseteq B,\ B \in \mathcal{K}(M)\}$.

There is $x \in M$ such that for each $x \in B \in \mathcal{B}$, $G(B)$ is unbounded in ω_1. Otherwise $\mathcal{B}' = \{B \in \mathcal{B} :\ G(B) \text{ is bounded}\}$ is also a base of X that is closed under finite intersections and unions. Therefore the $G(B)$'s cover ω_1, but this is a contradiction since there are only countably many of them.

For a cardinal θ let $H(\theta)$ be the set of all sets with $< \theta$-sized transitive closure. We know that if θ is regular and uncountable, all axioms of ZFC, with the exception of the Power Set Axiom, are true in $H(\theta)$. Suppose S is co-stationary and θ is a regular cardinal large enough so that $H(\theta)$ contains all sets we need in this argument. As in the proof of Lemma 1 in [23], let E be a countable elementary submodel of $H(\theta)$ such that $\phi, S, M, \mathcal{B}, G \in E$ and $\omega_1 \cap E \in \omega_1 \backslash S$.

By elementarity there is $x \in M \cap E$ with decreasing local base $\{B_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ at x such that each $G(B_n)$ is unbounded in ω_1. Then, by elementarity and since $G(B_n)$ is unbounded, for each n and $\alpha \in \omega_1 \cap E$ there is $K_{n,\alpha} \in \mathcal{K}(M) \cap E$ such

that $K_{n,\alpha} \subseteq B_n$ and $\sup(\phi(K_{n,\alpha})) \geq \alpha$. Then $K_{n,\alpha} \in E$ and $K_{n,\alpha}$ is countable. So, $K_{n,\alpha} \subseteq \omega_1 \cap E$. Pick $\{\alpha_n : n \in \omega_1\}$ such that $\{\alpha_n\}_n$ converges to $\omega_1 \cap E$ and let $K = \{x\} \cup \bigcup_{n\in\omega} K_{n,\alpha_n}$. Then $K \in \mathcal{K}(M)$ and $\phi(K_{n,\alpha_n}) \subseteq \phi(K)$ for each n. But this contradicts $\phi(K) \in \mathcal{K}(S)$ and $\omega_1 \cap N \notin S$. □

Proposition 32. *Let S be a subset of ω_1 that contains a cub set. Then $\omega_1 \times \omega \geq_T (S, \mathcal{K}(S))$. Hence $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{Q}) \geq_T (S, \mathcal{K}(S))$.*

Proof. Fix $S \subseteq \omega_1$ and a cub set $C \subseteq S$. Let $C = \{\beta_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ be the increasing enumeration of C. For each $\alpha \in \omega_1$ enumerate $[\beta_\alpha, \beta_{\alpha+1}] \cap S$ as $\{x_{\alpha,n} : n \in \omega\}$, with repetitions if necessary, and let $F_{\alpha,n} = \{x_{\alpha,0}, x_{\alpha,1}, \ldots, x_{\alpha,n}\}$.

Define $\phi : \omega_1 \times \omega \to \mathcal{K}(S)$ by $\phi((\alpha, n)) = \overline{\bigcup_{\gamma\leq\alpha} F_{\gamma,n}}$. Since C is a cub set, the only limit points of $\bigcup_{\gamma\leq\alpha} F_{\gamma,n}$ outside $\bigcup_{\gamma\leq\alpha} F_{\gamma,n}$ are in C, so $\phi((\alpha, n))$ is indeed in $\mathcal{K}(S)$. Clearly, ϕ is order-preserving and the image covers S. □

Corollary 33. *For unbounded $S \subseteq \omega_1$, there exists a separable metrizable M with $\mathcal{K}(M) \geq_T S$ if and only if S is in the cub filter.*

Corollary 34. *For $S \subseteq \omega_1$, there exists a separable metrizable M with $\mathcal{K}(M) \geq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$ if and only if $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is bounded.*

Proof. If $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is bounded then $S = C \oplus N$, where C is a closed unbounded set or an empty set and N is countable (i.e. $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is bounded). Then, since cub sets are homeomorphic to ω_1, $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{Q}) \geq_T \mathcal{K}(C)$. Since N is Polish, $\omega^\omega \geq_T \mathcal{K}(N)$. Now set $M = \mathbb{Q}$ and we have $\mathcal{K}(S) = \mathcal{K}(C) \times \mathcal{K}(N) \leq_T \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{Q}) \times \mathcal{K}(\omega^\omega) \leq_T \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{Q}) \times \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{Q}) =_T \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{Q})$.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{K}(M) \geq_T \mathcal{K}(S)$ for some M, then S contains a closed unbounded set. If, in addition, $\overline{S}\backslash S$ is unbounded then $\mathcal{K}(S) =_T \Sigma(\omega^{\omega_1})$, which contradicts Proposition 30. □

5.2. **Function Spaces.** For any space X let $C(X)$ be the set of all real-valued continuous functions on X. Let $\mathbf{0}$ be the constant zero function on X. For any function f from $C(X)$, subset S of X and $\epsilon > 0$ let $B(f, S, \epsilon) = \{g \in C(X) : |f(x) - g(x)| < \epsilon \ \forall x \in S\}$. Write $C_p(X)$ for $C(X)$ with the pointwise topology (so basic neighborhoods of an f in $C_p(X)$ have the form $B(f, F, \epsilon)$ where F is finite and $\epsilon > 0$). Write $C_k(X)$ for $C(X)$ with the compact-open topology (so basic neighborhoods of an f in $C_k(X)$ have the form $B(f, K, \epsilon)$ where K is compact and $\epsilon > 0$). In [12] the authors established connections between the function spaces $C_p(X)$ and $C_k(X)$ and the poset $\mathcal{K}(X)$. Using these connections the authors also obtained $2^\mathfrak{c}$-sized families of functions spaces from a $2^\mathfrak{c}$-sized family of pairwise Tukey-incomparable $\mathcal{K}(M)$'s where M's are separable metrizable spaces. Here we derive similar results for subsets of ω_1.

A space X is strongly ω-bounded if and only if whenever $\{K_n : n \in \omega\}$ is a countable family of compact subsets of X, then $\overline{\bigcup\{K_n : n \in \omega\}}$ is compact. Let $\mathcal{F}(X) = \{F \subseteq X : F \text{ is finite}\} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$. The following result was proven in [12].

Proposition 35. *Let X and Y be spaces.*

(1) Suppose that X is not strongly ω-bounded and there is a linear embedding of $C_p(Y)$ into $C_p(X)$. Then $(\mathcal{F}(X), \mathcal{K}(X)) \geq_T (\mathcal{F}(Y), \mathcal{K}(Y))$.

(2) Suppose that either there is a continuous open surjection of $C_k(X)$ onto $C_k(Y)$ or $C_k(Y)$ embeds in $C_k(X)$. Then $\mathcal{K}(X) \times \omega \geq_T \mathcal{K}(Y) \times \omega$, and if neither X nor Y are strongly ω-bounded spaces then $\mathcal{K}(X) \geq_T \mathcal{K}(Y)$.

Lemma 36. *Let S and T be subsets of ω_1. If S and T are co-stationary and there is a continuous linear surjection of $C_p(S)$ onto $C_p(T)$ then (a) $\mathcal{K}(S) \geq_T \mathcal{K}(T)$ and (b) $(\mathcal{F}(S), \mathcal{K}(S)) \geq_T (\mathcal{F}(T), \mathcal{K}(T))$.*

Proof. Let X and Y be any spaces such that there is a continuous linear surjection from $C_p(S)$ onto $C_p(T)$. Then for any compact $L \subseteq Y$, $\overline{\operatorname{supp} L}$ is a compact subset of X and for any closed and functionally bounded $K \subseteq X$, $L = \{y \in Y : \operatorname{supp} y \subseteq K\}$ is closed and functionally bounded [1]. Here $A \subseteq X$ is called functionally bounded if and only if $f(A)$ is bounded for any $f \in C_p(X)$. For subsets of co-stationary $S \subseteq \omega_1$ being closed and functionally bounded is equivalent to being compact. To see this, take a closed subset of S, say C. If C is not closed in ω_1, then C contains an increasing sequence that converges to a point outside S and we can find $f \in C_p(S)$ such that $f(C)$ is unbounded. Therefore, C must be closed in ω_1 and since S is co-stationary it must be bounded. So C is compact. Now the map $\phi : \mathcal{K}(S) \to \mathcal{K}(T)$ defined by $K \mapsto \{y \in Y : \operatorname{supp} y \subseteq K\}$ is well-defined, order-preserving and since for each $L \in \mathcal{K}(T)$, $L \subseteq \phi(\overline{\operatorname{supp} L})$, it is also cofinal. From the definition it is clear that $\phi(\mathcal{F}(S))$ is cofinal for $\mathcal{F}(T)$ in $\mathcal{K}(T)$, which establishes part (b). □

Now we apply Theorem 25. It is easy to see (and was shown in [12]) that $\mathcal{K}(X) \not\geq_T (Y, \mathcal{K}(Y))$ implies $(\mathcal{F}(X), \mathcal{K}(X)) \not\geq_T (\mathcal{F}(Y), \mathcal{K}(Y))$. Notice that whenever $S \subseteq \omega_1$ is not closed, S is not strongly ω-bounded. Since the 2^{ω_1}-sized family of subsets of ω_1 from Theorem 25 consists of stationary and co-stationary (therefore not closed) subsets of ω_1, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 37. *There is a 2^{ω_1}-sized family $\mathcal{A}$ of subsets of ω_1 such that:*

1. *if S and T are distinct elements of $\mathcal{A}$, then $C_k(S)$ is not a continuous open image of $C_k(T)$ and does not embed in $C_k(T)$, and*
2. *if S and T are distinct elements of $\mathcal{A}$, then there is no linear surjection of $C_p(S)$ onto $C_p(T)$ and no linear embedding of $C_p(S)$ in $C_p(T)$.*

References

[1] A.V. Arkhangel'skii (editor), *General Topology III*, Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences 51, Springer, 1995.

[2] A.V. Arkhangel'skii. *Topological Function Spaces. Mathematics and its Applications*, (78) Kluver Academic Publishers. Netherlands. 1992.

[3] B. Cascales and J. Orihuela, *A Biased View of Topology as a Tool in Functional Analysis*, Recent Progress in General Topology III. (2014) 93–164.

[4] B. Cascales, J. Orhuela, and V.V. Tkachuk, *Domination by second countable spaces and Lindelof Σ property*, Topology Appl. (158), 204–214, 2011.

[5] J.P.R. Christensen, *Topology and Borel Structure*, North-Holland, Amsterdam-London; American Elsevier, New York, 1974.

[6] N. Dobrinen and S. Todorčević, *A new class of Ramsey-classification theorems and their application in the Tukey theory of ultrafilters, Part 1*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 366 (2013), no. 3, 1659–1684.

[7] N. Dobrinen and S. Todorčević, *Tukey types of ultrafilters*, Illinois Journal of Mathematics, 55 (2011), no. 3, 907–951.

[8] D.H. Fremlin, *Measure Theory, Volume 5*, Torres Fremlin, 2000.

[9] D.H. Fremlin, *Families of compact sets and Tukey's ordering*, Atti Sem. Mat. Fis. Univ. Modena 39 (1991), no. 1, 29–50.

[10] D.H. Fremlin, *The partially ordered sets of measure theory and Tukey's ordering*, Note Mat. 11 (1991), 177–214, Dedicated to the memory of Professor Gottfried Köthe.

[11] P.M. Gartside and A. Mamatelashvili, *Tukey order, calibres and spectra*. In preparation.

[12] P.M. Gartside and A. Mamatelashvili, *Tukey order on compact subsets of separable metric spaces*, to appear in the Journal of Symbolic Logic.

[13] M. Husek and J. van Mill (editors), *Recent Progress in General Topology II*, North-Holland, 2002.
[14] J.R. Isbell, *Seven cofinal types*, J. London Math Society, (2) 4 (1972), 394–416.
[15] A. Louveau and B. Velickovic, *Analytic ideals and cofinal types*, Ann. of Pure and Applied Logic, 99 (1999), 171–195.
[16] A. Mamatelashvili, *Tukey Order on Sets of Compact Subsets of Topological Spaces*, PhD thesis, `http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/21920/1/A.M._thesis_final_4.pdf`.
[17] D. Milovich, *Tukey classes of ultrafilters on ω*, Spring Topology and Dynamics Conference, Topology Proc., 32 (2008), Spring, 351–362.
[18] E.H. Moore and H.L. Smith, *A general theory of limits*, Amer. Journal of Math, 44 (1922), 102–121.
[19] J.T. Moore and S. Solecki, *A G_δ ideal of compact sets strictly above the nowhere dense ideal in the Tukey order*, Ann. of Pure and Applied Logic, 156 (2008), 270–273.
[20] D. Raghavan and S. Todorčević, *Cofinal types of ultrafilters*, Ann. of Pure and Applied Logic, 163 (2012), 185–199.
[21] S. Solecki and S. Todorčević, *Avoiding families and Tukey functions on the nowhere-dense ideal*, Journal of the Inst. of Math. Jussieu, (2011) 10(2), 405–435.
[22] S. Solecki and S. Todorčević, *Cofinal types of topological directed orders*, Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble, 54, 6 (2004), 1877–1911.
[23] S. Todorčević, *Directed sets and cofinal types*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 290 (1985), no. 2, 711–723.
[24] J.W. Tukey, *Convergence and unifomity in topology*, Ann. Math Studies, 2, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1940.

Department of Mathematics, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260, USA
E-mail address: `gartside@math.pitt.edu`

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849, USA
E-mail address: `azm0105@auburn.edu`